

From: Marti Kie <mkie@water.ca.gov>
To: DOM_SA.PO_PBR(AitchiD)
Date: 5/18/99 4:13PM
Subject: Fwd: Re: species goals -Reply

>Date: Tue, 18 May 1999 10:42:22 -0700
 >To: Kevin Shaffer <KSHAFFER@hq.dfg.ca.gov>
 >From: Marti Kie <mkie@water.ca.gov>
 >Subject: Re: species goals -Reply

>

>Kevin,

>

>I'm not sure what you mean by the ERP still doesn't contain conservation
 >measures. It wasn't supposed to. For what species and or
 >habitats/processes is it missing targets, objectives or actions that you
 >think are necessary for it to have?

>

>I am not aware of any other project that is told it must recover the species
 >that may be impacted by its actions. I understand that in order to be
 >considered an NCCP a project's conservation plan is held to a higher
 >standard than what would be required for mitigating project impacts. If the
 >ERP isn't considered that which gets us to the higher standard, we will need
 >the reasoning for why not documented. I'm not talking about for those
 >species that are associated with habitats not considered in the ERP, or for
 >species that are found outside of the eco zones.

>

>Marti

>

>

>At 09:18 AM 5/18/99 -0700, you wrote:

>>Marti,

>>

>>Re: Species designations & conservation measures.

>>

>>1. Mason's lilaeopsis:

>> As far as I and botanists are concerned, Mason's lilaeopsis
 >>potentially will be impacted significantly. More importantly,
 >>the range of the species is w/i the CALFED area, and thus,
 >>CALFED actions likely have the species fate in their
 >>control-- thus R.

>> Mason's lilaeopsis has been one of the most visible of delta
 >>plants with regards to conservation effort or lack of. It is
 >>not stable or increasing in #, habitat quality, or any other
 >>measure of species viability. In addition, if ERP does not
 >>take action for conservation, other common programs (levee
 >>maintenance, water transfer) are likely to greatly contribute
 >>to the decline of lilaeopsis.

>>

>>2. Conservation measures highlighted in the JSA table:

>> I have distributed Pete Rawling's table to DFG biologists
 >>that took part in the MSCS workshops or with expertise in
 >>one or more of the R/r taxa.

>> To the person, they have shared that each measure in that
 >>table is essential for the basic protection of the given taxon.

>> In addition, it has been brought to my attention that ERP
 >>still does not contain conservation measures
 >>[recommendations/comments] shared with CALFED prior
 >>to the MSCS initiative. I have yet to hear from biologists
 >>regarding the fishes.
 >> Thus, as I have maintained before, we need to include all
 >>the measures in either the MSCS or ERP. In addition, it is
 >>my hope that DFG will have the time to compare Pete's
 >>table, the tables in the draft MSCS, and the tables produced
 >>from the expert meetings to determine if essential measures
 >>from the expert tables have not made it into the draft MSCS
 >>or Pete's review.